

### **Remarks**

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-9, 11, 13, 15-17, 19, 21 and 23-32 are pending in this application. Of these, claims 1, 9 and 17 are independent claims.

Claim 1 has been amended in several respects. Firstly, the preamble has been amended to remove the unintended artifact "or updated." Secondly, the word "automatically" has been inserted before the word "transmitting" on the basis of original claim 6. Thirdly, the last portion of the claim has been amended to recite "wherein said set of wireless communications devices is one of a plurality of predefined groups of wireless communications devices in communication with said server, said one predefined group being selected from said plurality, wherein said automatically transmitting is only performed for selected ones of said predefined groups." This amendment is supported in the original application, e.g. at paragraphs 0079-0080, 0082 and 0084. Similar amendments have been made to the other independent claims, i.e. claims 9 and 17.

Claim 3 has been amended to insert the word "automatically" before the word "transmitting" and to replace "to which access is provided as a whole" with "associated with the selected one of said predefined groups of wireless communications devices." This amendment is supported in the original application, e.g. in claim 25 and paragraph 0080. Claims 11 and 19 have been similarly amended.

Claim 5 has been amended to replace the text "said transmitting is dependent upon receipt of an indication from a human operator" with "selection of said predefined

groups of wireless communications devices is performed by a human operator via a graphical user interface.” This amendment is for consistency with amended claim 1 and is supported in the original application, e.g., at paragraphs 0082 and 0084 and in FIG. 9. Claims 13 and 21 have been similarly amended.

In view of these amendments, claims 4, 6, 12, 14, 20 and 22 have been cancelled.

Claim 25 has been amended for consistency with amended claim 1.

New claim 27 depends from method claim 1 and expressly contemplates a scenario wherein one predefined group of the plurality of groups of mobile devices is unselected such that the automatic transmitting is not performed for that group. The claim is supported in original paragraphs 0082 and 0084 and in FIG. 9. New claims 29 and 31 are corresponding server and machine-readable medium claims which depend from claims 9 and 17 respectively.

New claim 28 depends from method claim 3 and further specifies that each predefined group of the plurality of groups of mobile devices represents wireless communication devices allocated to employees of a distinct department of a business enterprise and wherein the applications in the group of applications are all related to one of the distinct departments of the business enterprise. This amendment is support in original paragraphs 0079 and 0080. New claims 30 and 32 are corresponding server and machine-readable medium claims which depend from claims 11 and 19 respectively.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner maintained his rejection of the pending claims under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by US 2005/0154759 to Hofmeister et al. ("Hofmeister"). The Examiner considered the "first limitation" identified at page 2 of the Applicant's response dated February 17, 2010 to be shown in Hofmeister paragraphs 0029, 0050, 0053 and 0072, despite the Applicant's arguments averring that no such limitation is shown. The Examiner did not respond to the Applicant's argument to the effect that that the "second limitation" identified at page 3 of the response dated February 17, 2010, i.e. "wherein said set of wireless communications devices is a subset of an overall set of wireless communications devices in communication with said server," was not shown. In that regard, Advisory Action was incomplete.

Nevertheless, in the interest of advancing prosecution the Applicant has amended the claims as described above. It is submitted that, in view of these claim amendments, each of the currently pending claims recites at least two limitations that are not disclosed in the cited portions of Hofmeister and that, accordingly, none of the claims is anticipated by Hofmeister.

The first limitation that is not disclosed in the cited portions of Hofmeister is "wherein said set of wireless communications devices is one of a plurality of predefined groups of multiple wireless communications devices in communication with said server."

Hofmeister fails to disclose any plurality of predefined groups of multiple wireless communication devices. The "send to a friend" feature, described at Hofmeister paragraph 0075 for example, only contemplates sending a push message to a single destination mobile device, which cannot constitute a predefined group of multiple

wireless communications devices.

The second limitation that is not disclosed in the cited portions of Hofmeister is “said one predefined group being selected from said plurality, wherein said automatically transmitting is only performed for selected ones of said predefined groups” (emphasis added). It has already been submitted that no plurality of predefined groups of multiple wireless communications devices is disclosed in Hofmeister. It follows that no one of these predefined groups is selected from among a plurality of such groups. Moreover, the “Send-to-a-Friend” feature only sends a push message upon selection of the application, selection of the send-to-a-friend option and collection of destination information for the friend (see Hofmeister paras. 0073-0075 and FIG. 8, reference numerals 800-810). As such, the sending of that push message cannot be said to constitute “automatically transmitting.”

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claim 1 is patentably distinct over the cited art. The same reasoning applies to corresponding claims 9 and 17 and, by logical implication, to all of the dependent claims. Withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is therefore requested.

The features of amended claims 3, 5, 11, 13, 19 and 21, and of new claims 27-32, only serve to further distinguish over the art of record and thus further contribute to patentability.

At page 3 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner objected to the disclosure as non-compliant with 37 CFR 1.74. While the Applicant does not necessarily agree that

the disclosure is non-compliant in view of the mention of Appendix "A" in paragraph 0038 of the disclosure as filed, the Applicant has nevertheless amended that paragraph to expressly recite FIGS. 20A-20LLL. Withdrawal of the objection is accordingly requested.

No new matter is believed to have been added by any of the above-noted amendments.

In view of the foregoing, favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter Elyjiw  
Registration No. 58,893

**SMART & BIGGAR**  
438 University Avenue  
Suite 1500, Box 111  
Toronto, Ontario  
Canada M5G 2K8

Telephone: (416) 593-5514  
Facsimile: (416) 591-1690

Date: April 19, 2010  
PAE/jbs 93422-48